

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1, 3, 6, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rothberg et al. (US 6,412,083).

5

Response:

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 1 now specifies that each application program of the electronic device has a separate section of memory for storing corresponding application data, and all of the application data of the section of
10 memory corresponding to the application program is erased when the error checking algorithm detects an error in the application data. This amendment is supported in the last half of paragraph [0014] of the specification, and no new matter is added through this amendment.

15 On the other hand, Rothberg teaches in column 5, lines 20-30 a method of locating sectors on a hard disk drive that are defective. When a defective sector is found, the user is given the choice of deleting the file that contains the defective sector. If the user decides to delete the file, the file is deleted and the operating system instructs the disk drive to write null values into the logical address of the defective sector.

20

Thus, Rothberg only teaches deleting a single file and does not teach deleting all data within a memory sector corresponding to an application program, as is claimed in the currently amended claim 1. Rothberg does not teach separating application data corresponding to different application programs into separate sections of memory, and
25 also does not teach deleting all data within a memory sector corresponding to an application program. For these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Rothberg. Claims 3, 6, and 10 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.

Appl. No. 10/708,601
Amdt. dated October 27, 2006
Reply to Office action of September 12, 2006

Reconsideration of claims 1, 3, 6, and 10 is therefore respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

5 Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothberg
et al. (US 6,412,083).

Response:

 Claims 7-9 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowable if claim 1 is allowable.
Reconsideration of claims 7-9 is respectfully requested.

10

 Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

15

Winston Hsu

Date: 10/27/2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

20 Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.
is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)